

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA
NORTHWESTERN DIVISION**

United States of America,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING MOTION
)	FOR BOND REVIEW
vs.)	
)	
Michael Raymond Walker,)	
)	Case No: 4:13-cr-105
Defendant.)	

Before the court is “Defendant Michael Raymond Walker’s Motion for Bond Review” filed May 8, 2014. The Government filed a response opposing the motion of May 15, 2014.

Defendant is charged with conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute heroin. The court held a detention hearing on the matter on April 11, 2014, and ordered defendant detained pending trial. The reasons for detention included defendant’s condition at his initial appearance, which suggested recent drug use; the proffered evidence regarding drugs and weapons discovered during a stop of defendant’s vehicle in Utah and May 2013; the evidence recovered during a recent search of defendant’s residence, which included several firearms and items indicative of drug use; and the indication that two young children living in defendant’s residence at the time of the arrest tested positive for cocaine.

In the Motion for Bond Review now before the court, defendant argues release would be appropriate for a number of reasons including the facts that defendant would be able to take prescription medication for back pain that is unavailable while he is in custody, that defendant would be better able to participate in preparation for trial, and that defendant would be able to return to his job or would have other employment opportunities available. Defendant further argues that many of the reasons given for his detention applied equally to Coya Walker, his wife and codefendant,

who was released on conditions. The government responds that the information regarding the search of defendant's residence at the time of his arrest for the instant offense was not available at the time of Coya Walker's detention hearing and that defendant presents a danger to the community for the reasons included in the original detention order. The government further responds that while it believes release on any set of conditions is inappropriate, an additional problem exists because defendant would be required to vacate his former residence by the end of May 2014. This is consistent with information presented to the court during a hearing on a petition for revocation of defendant Coya Walker's pretrial release held May 15, 2014.

For the reasons stated in the original order of detention pending trial and in the government's response opposing the motion, the court finds no alternative less restrictive than detention is appropriate in this case. Defendant's Motion for Bond Review (Docket No. 222) is **DENIED**.

Dated this 16th day of May, 2014.

/s/ Charles S. Miller, Jr.
Charles S. Miller, Jr., Magistrate Judge
United States District Court